

have in mind the unfortunate wording of the *Programme of Courses in Biology* at the University of Chicago which has recently come under my eye. In it I discover a classification of the biological sciences that is, as I have characterized it, unfortunate, for it comes under the supervision of a very able zoologist and consequently from a region whence we might have looked for better things. Under the head of "organization of the school" six departments are mentioned. These are: 1, zoology; 2, anatomy; 3, neurology; 4, palaeontology; 5, physiology; 6, botany. From such a classification it is plain that the position of botany in a *true* classification is not apprehended. The erroneous use of the word botany in such a connection is no less remarkable than the erroneous use of the word zoology as exclusive of anatomy, for example. But this will hardly palliate the offence against accurate use of terms in the setting off of botany as coördinate with palaeontology or neurology, and such parallelism is clearly indicated in the grouping used in the circular before me. It is a matter of regret to us all that in an institution of so much promise as the new Chicago University there should be so evidently retrogressive a movement. While over the world and here at home in our Association there is seen going on the segregation of the different branches of biological science and the accurate limiting of their fields, this classification of the Chicago programme is a movement backward to the old natural-history group (though under another name); and even in this group there is what a humble botanical worker with no pretensions to the name of biologist must be permitted to say is contrary to what he has been taught is an exact use of words, and certainly opposed to what he has been led to believe by study and reading and observation to be a correct classification of science-groups.

If a display of the material side would have any effect upon the minds of these wanderers from the philological fold, I suggest that the botanists present it, for their science, at Madison in 1893.—CONWAY MACMILLAN, *University of Minnesota*.

An International Botanical Congress.

Since the meeting of the botanists at Rochester last August it has become evident that an international botanical congress should be held in 1893 in this country. Upon the return of Professor Underwood from Genoa, with his report of what was done there, as well as of what was left undone, such a congress seemed a necessity, especially when it was learned that the delegates to the Genoa congress expected one to be held in America this year in order to complete the work left by them. The Columbian Exposition will doubtless bring many botanists to this country during the year. Most of these will attend our scientific meetings if possible, and it seems wise to take advantage of this and to arrange for a formal congress. There being no committee to take charge of the work of preparing for the congress, after consultation with a number of botanists, it was thought advisable that the chairman of the Section of Botany of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the president of the Botanical Club, Dr. Wilson, should appoint a committee to take the matter in hand. Accordingly on Dec. 9th, notices were sent to the following gentlemen

with the request that they serve on such committee: J. C. Arthur, L. H. Bailey, N. L. Britton, D. H. Campbell, J. M. Coulter, B. T. Galloway, Conway MacMillan, B. L. Robinson, William Trelease, L. M. Underwood, George Vasey.

May I not ask a hearty support be given to the committee by every botanist, to the end that the congress may be every way successful.—
CHARLES E. BESSEY, *Chairman Section G (Botany), A. A. A. S.*

Lesquereux's Flora of the Dakota Group: A reply.

In the October number of the GAZETTE I find a review of Lesquereux's *Flora of the Dakota Group*, which I seem to have been so unfortunate in editing. As this review is so evidently the vehicle of a personal attack, you will, I trust, grant me space for a few words of editorial explanation. My reviewer says: "The best method of editing a posthumous work is, undoubtedly, to carry it out in the same spirit in which it was written, taking all facts into consideration." Had he taken the trouble to read the editor's preface he would have seen that this was precisely what has been done. The only changes made in the MS. as submitted by Lesquereux, except such slight verbal ones as were necessary to make the meaning more clear, *are mentioned in foot-notes* (twenty-three in number) *signed with the editor's initials, and the whole, if gathered together, would not fill one printed page!* The book is Lesquereux's own, and the criticism therefore becomes one of the author, not of the editor.

But let us examine some of the so-called editorial blunders. There are, we are informed, "incorrect citations." As only high ecclesiastics lay claim to infallibility, it is not perhaps remarkable that out of nearly a thousand bibliographic references, including page, plate and figure, a few errors should creep in, but it would have been more satisfactory had some of them, or at least one, been pointed out! "The plates . . . are poorly arranged." The plates are divided into three series, the first embracing forty-five plates, the second nineteen plates, and the third three plates, and the figures are arranged upon them (of course in three series) as nearly in systematic order as the size and character of the drawings will permit. This arrangement was fixed by the author before the editor assumed charge, for as stated in the editor's preface, the book was completed once, and sent to Washington, but before it could be taken up for publication a great amount of new material was discovered in Kansas, and Lesquereux asked that the manuscript and plates be returned to him. This new material added 110 new species and twenty-one plates. Lesquereux left figures for nineteen of these plates, and the remaining three were made under the supervision of the editor. The author made hundreds of references and cross-references to the plates as thus arranged. To have changed this arrangement would not only have involved many errors, but was actually impossible, for the tint of the India ink work was not the same on the last series of plates as on the first, and hence they could not have been reproduced by the mechanical processes required at the government printing office, had the two kinds been mixed on the same plate.

"The spelling of names is inconsistent." It is indeed a *gross* typo-